

FISH & NEAVE
875 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022-6250

C O P Y

October 17, 1990

RECEIVED
PHILIP MORRIS MANAGEMENT CORP.
LAW DEPT--PATENT SECTION

AIR MAIL

Mr. John H. Bass
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL
ENGLAND

OCT 22 1990

NOTED

Re: Pakistani Pat. Appln. No. 292/89
Your File: 30591
Our File: PM-1322 (Pakistan)

Dear John:

Thank you for your October 3, 1990 letter
enclosing a copy of the official action in this case.

With respect to Paragraph 1 of the action, I do
not see in what way the marked phases can be considered
unclear. For that reason, I agree with you and your
Pakistani associate. I take it that your associate can make
an appropriate argument along those lines in accordance with
Pakistani practice.

With respect to Paragraph 2, I would agree with
your associate's suggestion, subject to the inclusion of the
word "substantially" as in the specification.

With respect to Paragraph 3, I assume this arose
because the Pakistani application was filed with the
abstract page at the front.

With respect to Ellis et al. U.S. Patent
3,356,094, a copy is enclosed. You are correct that it
inadvertently escaped the deletion of identification of
prior art. I recall that in some other countries, those
identifications had to be put back in. However, here, and
elsewhere where there has been no such requirement, I wonder

2023049171

Mr. John H. Bass

October 17, 1990

2

if, for consistency, it is possible to delete the identification of Ellis, so that page 2, lines 2-4 read "... article. In a similar smoking article, the tube becomes ...". I do not expect this to obviate the need to supply a copy of Ellis, but it might make the specification read better. Please let me have your thoughts.

Please let me know if you need anything further to prepare a response.

Very truly yours,

JEFFREY H. INGERMAN

JHI:bas
Enc.

Jeffrey H. Ingerman

cc: Ms. Beverly A. Montee (w/o enc.)

2023049172